

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-22 and 27-35 are pending, claims 1-4, 7-13, 15, 18, 21 and 22 having been amended without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 6 and 17 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 30-35 having been newly added.

Rejection of Claims 1-22 and 27-29

On page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,748,789 to Lee et al. (“Lee”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,090 to Lennon et al. (“Lennon”).

Applicant canceled claims 6 and 17 without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection moot with respect to these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6 and 17 be withdrawn. Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1, 9, 13, 15, 18 and 21 obviate the rejection. Applicant further submits that the amendments to the remaining claims were made to either conform the claims with their respective independent claims or to improve the presentation of the claims and not to narrow the scope of the respective claims.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of encoding video content. The method includes, among other things, assigning a predefined model to each of at least two video content portions of the video content, wherein the assigning a predefined model to each of the at least two video content portions further comprises comparing descriptors associated with each of the at least two video content portions with corresponding stored model descriptors from a plurality of predefined content models, and assigning each of the at least two video content portions to a respective best content model from the plurality of predefined content models based on the comparing of the descriptors.

Applicant submits that neither Lee nor Lennon disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination, the above-mentioned feature required by claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5, 7 and 8 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 9, 13, 15, 18 and 21 recite similar features and are patentable over Lee in view of Lennon for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 9, 13, 15 and 18 and dependent claims 10-12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22 and 27-29 be withdrawn.

New Claims 30-35

Newly added claims 30-35 depend from claims 1, 9, 13, 15, 18 and 21, respectively, and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed with respect claims 1, 9, 13, 15, 18 and 21, as well as for reciting other features.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 1, 2006

Correspondence Address:

AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

By: Richard C. Irving

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433